

Remarks/Arguments

Claims 1-8 are pending. The claims have been amended to correct formality defects and to more clearly and distinctly claim the subject matter that applicant regards as his invention. No new matter is believed to be added by the present invention.

Objection to claim 1 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph

Applicant submits that the objection to claim 1 is overcome in view of the present amendment. In particular, claim 1 has been amended to delete the phrase "e.g." and the words "either" and "or." Additionally, the feature of "a modem or another telecommunication connection ..." is now recited in newly added claim 8.

Rejection of claims 1 and 4-7 under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Johnson (US Pat. No. 6,122,758)

Applicant submits that for the reasons discussed below present claim 1, and the claims that depend therefrom are not anticipated under 35 USC 102(e) by Johnson.

The present invention relates to a system having a plurality of device connected to one another via a home bus interface, that is, the devices are connected within a home network. Each of the devices includes characteristic system information associated therewith and transmits the data over the home bus interface. In this regard, amended claim 1 recites:

System having a plurality of devices connected to one another via a home bus interface, in particular an IEEE 1394 bus interface, wherein one of the devices contains a control unit which, when operated appropriately by a user, polls system data for other devices in this system via the home bus interface (emphasis added)

Newly added claim 8 similarly recites this feature. Applicant submits that nowhere does Johnson disclose or suggest such a feature.

Johnson is concerned with a network of microcontrollers for monitoring and diagnosing the environmental conditions of a computer. By contrast, the present invention relates to a plurality of separate devices connected in a home network via a home bus interface. Thus the claimed system is entirely distinguishable over the system disclosed by Johnson.

In an embodiment, Johnson teaches the uses of the I²C bus for transferring control and system information between the microcontrollers. Johnson provides a general description of the I²C bus in col. 7, lines 42-54. Johnson cites IEEE 1394 bus as being an alternative for the I²C bus. However, the I²C bus, or the "Inter IC Bus," is a well-known bus protocol for transferring control and system information **between integrated circuits within a device**. The I²C bus is solely used for connecting integrated circuits inside a single device, not for networking different home appliances.

Also, col. 16, lines 52-55 only disclose that a microcontroller begins to poll a microcontroller bus 310. Figure 4 shows that the microcontroller bus 310 is inside a computer system 100. So microcontroller bus 310 is not a home network bus, and Johnson is entirely concerned with operations within the computer. Therefore, Johnson does not disclose or suggest using a home bus interface as recited in present claims 1 and 8, and as such, claims 1 and 8, and the claims that depend therefrom, are not anticipated by Johnson.

Rejection of claim 2 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnson in view of Craig (US Pat. No. 6,266,809)


Craig is cited as teaching a mobile data medium being a smart card having a memory and that when operated appropriately by a user, the network computer communicates with the smart card for storing system data. However, the cited teachings of Craig fail to cure the defect of Johnson as applied to amended claim 1 as discussed above. Therefore, applicant submits that the combination of Johnson and Craig fails to disclose or suggest a notable feature of claim 1, and as such, claim 2, which depends from amended claim 1, is patentably distinguishable over the teachings of Johnson and Craig.

**Rejection of claim 3 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over
Johnson in view of Garner (US Pat. No. 6,112,085)**

Garner is cited as teaching a mobile satellite system having a write/read device for a chip card or a smart card for the purpose of providing storage for different output files. However, the cited teachings of Garner fail to cure the defect of Johnson as applied to amended claim 1 as discussed above. Therefore, applicant submits that the combination of Johnson and Garner fails to disclose or suggest a notable feature of claim 1, and as such, claim 3, which depends from amended claim 1, is patentably distinguishable over the teachings of Johnson and Garner.

Having fully addressed the Examiner's rejections it is believed that, in view of the preceding amendments and remarks, this application stands in condition for allowance. Accordingly then, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully solicited. If, however, the Examiner is of the opinion that such action cannot be taken, the Examiner is invited to contact the applicant's attorney at (609) 734-6815, so that a mutually convenient date and time for a telephonic interview may be scheduled.

Respectfully submitted,
E. Schroder.

By: 
Paul P. Kiel
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 40,677

THOMSON Licensing Inc.
PO Box 5312
Princeton, NJ 08543-5312

Date: Jan 5, 2005

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this amendment is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail, postage prepaid, in an envelope addressed to Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 on:

1-5-05
Date

Lori M. Klewin
Lori Klewin